

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: August 14, 2003

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission
Shea Lubecke, Architectural Review Commission
Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission
Lisa McCauley, Acting Chair, Architectural Review Commission
John Patsey, Architectural Review Commission

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Planner

Call to Order

Chair Julian called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

Roll Call

The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, absent; Lisa McCauley, absent; Shea Lubecke, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; John Patsey, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Old Business

ARC 03-13 Carter Residence- 240 West Lake Street (2nd Preliminary Meeting)

Petitioner: Kevin Carter, owner

Mr. Carter stated that they did adopt a few suggestions that came up in last review, such as the change in shape of back and keeping the porch on the side of the house. Drawing A 0.1 shows the porch left open on outside- kept in new scheme- access to side yard. The petitioner changed proportions of bay on side. The petitioner added a smaller bay on addition so it does not compete w/ larger bay in dining room. All new work will match existing work. Location of existing garage is right behind house. Mr. Carter showed diagrams on overhead. Mr. Carter is proposing to extend roofline and eve lines straight back and make an addition on east elevation.

Mr. Julian asked about the existing roofline.

Mr. Carter showed the existing floor plan. Last meeting suggested to keep the "play area" and said they have taken that suggestion. Said they are opening it up to the interior and restoring the original access to yard. They will have to jack it up, restore the side windows and put the proper footing underneath it. Mr. Carter stated that the existing garage is right behind house and is very close. He says that the space between house and garage is not very big and is paved in poor condition. When they extend house back, cannot physically do it with garage where it is. Garage dates back to 60s or 70s. Shows proposed garage in south elevation. Mr. Carter stated they will try to keep the same style as the house for the new garage.

Mr. Sbiral asked if it was showing 5 feet off the rear and 3 feet off the side.

Mr. Carter said it is actually showing 2 feet off the rear so they will have to appear before the ZBA. This will give them more breathing room between the house and garage. Says neighbor's garage is also only 2 feet off the back of the property and says they have spoken with neighbors and they are agreeable to design.

Mr. Julian said to look at other cases to discuss setbacks of garages, to extent it affects the look.

Mr. Petersen asked about roof plan on first page. On the back between the bay and the addition there is a little piece of roof in line with the bay. He stated that when he looked at elevations he doesn't see it.

Mr. Carter stated that it shows up in elevations as a gutter line and that it is actually flat. Eave line will still be on same plane as other eave line.

Mr. Petersen thinks garage might be too overpowering. Thinks putting it in the center draws too much attention to it. He suggested off-setting it more towards the house. Says there is another garage on Lake Street that is off to the side.

Mr. Carter says it is already a little offset. Says they are happy to look at whatever suggestions ARC has.

Mr. Petersen thinks that back bay is not working. Says attempt to save porch is good attempt but not sure if it is really working.

Ms. Lubecke thinks the project has made progress. She stated that one of the problems she has seen regularly, when an addition is built on the back of a home, the structure stops seeming like historic house and seems more modern. Ms. Lubecke said it doesn't look as though the attic is used for living, wondering if it is possible to lower original rear section of roof to increase flat roof on sides.

Mr. Carter shows that they did lower on the south elevation.

Mr. Petersen asked if there was supposed to be dormer on the back elevation.

Mr. Carter said that dormer on front and back don't match right now.

Ms. Lubecke said that they do not have to match. Historic houses are charming when they've been added onto, when they are similar but not exactly the same. She thought addition on front elevation helps the garage elevation, but not enough. She stated that she is concerned about side elevation over kitchen- trying to lower rear section of roof.

Mr. Carter stated that they did want to use the attic space. There is not a stair that goes up to attic but they are planning on using other stair to go up to attic.

Ms. Lubecke says mass in rear at the full height of the front volume destroys historic character of it. Thinks they should move the ridge back some, make some kind of adjustment. Ms. Lubecke thinks it is better than before but is uncomfortable with bay on the back. Says maybe it doesn't have to be a bay, can just be windows.

Mr. Carter thinks the bays are kind of important features, but they will look at other options.

Ms. Lubecke thinks that side door and reusing it is great idea. Wonders about garage placement; with other garage there, it is peeking out. She likes that it mirrors garage next to it. Thinks will have hard time getting 2 foot variation on back. Ms. Lubecke says whole garage façade is extremely symmetrical and makes garage look more important than house.

Mr. Carter says that he would be happy to work with something asymmetrical.

Ms. Lubecke noted that garages are more utilitarian and wants something asymmetrical. Instead of moving whole garage forward, maybe take some off the size of garage, such as 3 feet from the width.

Mr. Sbiral says if they move garage forward 3 feet, you move in front of the thirty foot setback line. Within the building setback codes they have to have 7 foot setback from side and they would probably be okay.

Ms. Lubecke stated she liked rear entry with French doors. Window over kitchen setting maybe needs brackets over it. She suggests adding in a fireplace.

Mr. Julian asked about porch entrance on one side and driveway on other side.

Mr. Carter stated the garden is important to them, which is why they were proposing that placement of the garage.

Mr. Julian thinks there is a lot more creativity that can be utilized in designing the driveway. Mr. Julian thinks the bay is out of place because the side entrance is more natural evolution. Putting bay on the back is not something he would expect. Would drop roofline, subordinate in back to front. On south elevation, does not like how busy it is on the right side.

Mr. Carter agrees. Thinks they will have better drawings at later date to address that issue.

Ms. Plummer commented on north elevation (2 windows on right side); said the shape is very modern.

Mr. Carter says they do not show any of true divided light on drawings. Intent is to make windows proportional to what is existing.

Ms. Plummer suggested revisiting the location of garage because it could have major impact on design.

Mr. Julian stated that having them close together, there was talk about it being impossible to maintain the garage from the outside with such little space between garages. He encouraged the petitioner to look into the Zoning Board of Appeals' history relative to garage variations.

Mr. Sbiral stated that 2 feet is more realistic than 1 foot. Says neighbors might have problems. Says of the garage variations they have received most are not recommended for approval. Says that he spoke to one of the neighbors and said they liked the placement of the garage in context to what was going on behind it.

New Business

ARC 03-16 312 West Main, Cedar Roofing Company (Historic- PRELIMINARY Public Hearing)

Petitioners: Matt Sorensen, 312 West Main Street, Matt Wilkenson

The petitioners were sworn in by Mr. Julian

Mr. Sorensen said 2 walls that were supposed to be preserved from existing garage were disposed of accidentally, proposing to build the same garage that was formerly approved by ARC.

Mr. Julian stated that was discussed and approved before was a compromise. He noted that all bets are off considering that they are starting from scratch. Mr. Julian said the ARC may say they should build something more historically appropriate.

Mr. Sbiral says proposed garage is setback in rear 30 feet of lot line, question as to how far back it must be set. Zoning Board requires 3 feet. The garage should be historically accurate.

Mr. Sorensen stated that the walls were not in great shape, but had instructed crew to save the walls for use in another garage.

Mr. Petersen says that if they are starting over, would like to see something else. He stated that he liked having 2 garage doors on main mass. Mr. Petersen suggested the petitioners try to make the garage complement the house.

Mr. Julian asked what the midpoint on the roofline would be. Said it looks low enough.

Mr. Wilkenson says it would be easy to center the peak. Said they could lower the pitch slightly if they need to. Due to lack of communication the walls were taken away. Suggestions: because it is a historical situation, they plan to take feedback from tonight to take back to architects to draw it up. Said they have the foundation in place and they are ready to get going on construction. They do intend to follow ARC's recommendation. Says if there are any changes from the side, they can probably simplify matters.

Ms. Lubecke thinks it needs to be re-centered over side elevation. Reevaluate window placement to see if it's appropriate.

Mr. Wilkenson says that the new windows will match existing. They would like to present for new windows rather than the old windows because they do not match.

Mr. Julian asked if they want garage windows to match house.

Mr. Wilkenson said yes. Thinks it will look the best historically speaking. Would also like to match doors. Do they modify just that garage, do they want to see anything else, alternate A or B for approval?

Mr. Sorenson asked about roofline adjustments.

Mr. Julian stated the original garage appeared to be older than the house.

Mr. Wilkenson says they could eliminate 2 wings (shown on diagram). They want to have the shingles match the house even though they are not really visible from the street because it seems appropriate.

Mr. Sbiral asked if they were proposing beveled siding that was on old garage.

Mr. Wilkenson said no. Siding and windows do not seem to be in same era at all.

Mr. Sorenson stated they would like to use ½ inch beveled siding (cedar) just like the house on the lower portions.

Mr. Julian said he does not want the garage to match the house. He has yet to see true old garage that matches main house. Mr. Julian stated that garages are always simpler and he thinks that works better. Mr. Julian thought windows on garage need to be bigger.

Ms. Plummer had no additional comments.

Mr. Petersen made a motion to continue to 7:30 pm September 11 meeting. Ms. Lubecke seconded. Voice vote recorded all yes.

Approval of Minutes

May 8, 2003

Motion to approve made by Mr. Petersen. Ms. Plummer seconded. Voice vote recorded all yes.

July 24, 2003

Mr. Julian asked for more time to review the minutes.

Mr. Sbiral discussed the Bussanmus hearing; what is the board's tolerance for continuing again?

Mr. Julian said they would probably deny it next time. He said that they can't close a hearing without a vote from the board.

Planner's Report

Mr. Sbiral mentioned some cases and meetings they would have to discuss more at the next meeting.

Adjournment:

Mr. Petersen made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all yes.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:48.

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Emerick, Recording Secretary

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission